



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/113,491	07/10/1998	ROSS W. CALLON	IBN-0002	8100

24739 7590 10/30/2002

CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY
PO BOX 187
AROMAS, CA 95004

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TOAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/113,491

Applicant(s)

CALLON ET AL.

Examiner

Toan D Nguyen

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-22,24-34,36-38 and 51-143 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-22,24-34,36-38 and 51-143 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 2-22, 27-34, 51-71, 74-104, 106-113 and 115-143 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. (U.S. Patent 5,764,624) in view of Moy (U.S. Patent 6,031,817).

For claims 2, 4, 6-7, 9-12, 14, 27, 30-33, 51, 53, 55-56, 58-63, 74, 77-80, 82-84, 86, 88-89, 91-96, 106, 109-112, 115, 117, 119-120, 122-127, 136 and 139-142, Endo et al. disclose ATM switching system and path changing method, comprising:

for at least one of the nodes, generating and storing an alternate output route out of the node such that, in the event that data to be transferred toward a destination node cannot be

forward to the next successive node over the link associated with the destination node, the at least one of the nodes can forward the data over the alternate output route toward the destination node (figure 9A, col. 7 lines 44-48);

after generating and storing the alternate output route, if data to be transferred toward a destination node cannot be forward to the next successive node over the link associated with the destination node, forwarding the data over the alternate output route toward the destination node (col. 7 lines 48-52).

However, Endo et al. do not disclose embedding the data in virtual packets addressed for the alternate route. In an analogous art, Moy discloses embedding the data in virtual packets addressed for the alternate route (figure 5, col. 10 lines 21-49). One skilled in the art would have recognized a communication link/virtual circuit table to use teaching of Moy in the system of Endo et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention, to use the communication link/virtual circuit table as taught by Moy in Endo et al.'s system with the motivation being to re-establish the virtual circuits (col. 10 lines 38-49).

For claims 3, 21, 28, 52, 70, 75, 85, 103, 107, 116, 134 and 137, Endo et al. disclose the alternate output is a connectionless route (figure 11, col. 8 lines 4-7).

For claims 5, 8, 22, 29, 54, 57, 71, 76, 87, 90, 104, 108, 118, 121, 133, 135 and 138, Endo et al. disclose the output alternate output route is a connection-oriented route (col. 9 lines 10-20).

For claims 20 and 69, Endo et al. disclose at least one node of the network is capable of operating in both a connectionless environment and a connection-oriented environment (col. 8 lines 4-7 and col. 9 lines 10-20).

For claims 15-19, 34, 64, 81, 97, 113, 128 and 143, Moy discloses the information that data can not be transferred between the at least one of the nodes and the next successive node includes a time at which nodes receiving the information should performed a recovery operation such that recovery operations at a plurality of nodes on the network are synchronized (col. 9 lines 3-26).

For claims 65-68, 98-101 and 129-132, Moy in view of Endo et al. disclose the information initiates a recovery operation at least one updating node on the network (col. 9 lines 18-26).

For claim 102, Endo et al. disclose at least one node of the network is capable of operating in both a connectionless environment and a connection-oriented environment (col. 8 lines 4-7 and col. 9 lines 10-20).

3. Claims 24-25, 36-37 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. (U.S. Patent 5,764,624) in view of Moy (U.S. Patent 6,031,817) further in view of Ferstenberg et al. (U.S. Patent 5,873,071).

For claims 24-25, 36-37 and 72, Endo et al. in view of Moy do not disclose the network comprises at least a portion of the Internet and intranet. In an analogous art, Ferstenberg et al. disclose the network comprises at least a portion of the Internet and intranet (col. 16 line 11). One skilled in the art would have recognized internet and intranet to use teaching of Ferstenberg et al. in the system of Endo et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention, to use the internet and intranet as taught by Ferstenberg et al. in Endo et al.'s system with the motivation being to use a private and public network (col. 16 line 11).

Art Unit: 2665

4. Claims 26, 38, 73, 105 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. (U.S. Patent 5,764,624) in view of Moy (U.S. Patent 6,031,817) further in view of Gerzberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,229,810B1).

For claims 26, 38, 73, 105 and 114, Endo et al. in view of Moy do not disclose the network comprises at least a portion of an extranet. In an analogous art, Gerzberg et al. disclose the network comprises at least a portion of an extranet (figure 18, col. 15 lines 38-48). One skilled in the art would have recognized the extranet to use teaching of Gerzberg et al. in the system of Endo et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention, to use the extranet as taught by Gerzberg et al. in Endo et al.'s system with the motivation being to provide the flexibility of point-to-point tunneling protocol allows the implementation to be client initiated or client transparent, but does require IP support (col. 15 lines 42-44).

Response To Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on August 08, 2002 have been fully considered, but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-0140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday (7:00AM-4:30PM).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on 703-308-6602. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2665

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

TN
T.N.



ALPUS H. HSU
PRIMARY EXAMINER